

morning business today. I would not worry about that at all.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Senator.

ELECTION REFORM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I see here one of the persons responsible for the amendment that has brought the Senate to a standstill—Senator WYDEN. I think it is really too bad that the amendment has brought the Senate to a standstill.

The opponents of the Schumer-Wyden amendment claim they are seeking to eliminate fraud and that is why they oppose the amendment. Well, of course, everybody in the Senate is against fraud. However, we over here believe that also we must do anything we can to stop disenfranchisement of voters.

I think it is so important to recognize that we need to encourage people to vote, and vote honestly. Nobody is encouraging people to vote by fraud. But by holding up this legislation—and that is what is happening—the opponents are preventing, among other things, \$3 billion going to the States for election reform efforts.

My State, Nevada, needs this money very badly. We have the most modern machines you can buy in southern Nevada, in Las Vegas. They are electronic, beautiful, and they are without fail. But in the other 16 counties, we have a mishmash of other types of machines. In the 1998 election Senator ENSIGN had with me, we had a registrar of voters in Washoe County, Reno, NV, who wanted to save the county money, so she had printed the ballots herself. They were approximately a 16th or a 32nd of an inch off. A lot of them didn't count. They didn't match the machines. It created all kinds of problems. In addition to that, there were—because of the inappropriateness of the machines—a number of ballots that were not counted because they were not put into the machines correctly.

In other counties, we have old-fashioned, very old punchcard machines. This legislation would allow the State of Nevada to have all good machines. That is one of the things being held up here—\$3 billion in funding going to the States for election reform efforts.

The secretary of state of Nevada, one of the most progressive secretaries of state, has been in conference with Senator DODD on this legislation. He is a Republican, by the way. He loves our legislation and thinks it should pass. He likes the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. We have letters from secretaries of state of Arkansas, Kentucky, and North Carolina, to name a few, who have strong reservations with the bill's original language dealing with identification.

Currently, there are 19 States and the District of Columbia that have signature verification. An additional 22 States use a signature system in conjunction with something else.

No eligible voter should be prevented from casting their vote. Remember, this bill still has to go to conference, and one of the things that so troubles me with the minority is the President of the United States is a member of their party. The leadership in the House is all Republican. So when we go to conference with this bill, we are in the minority because we are dealing with the President and the Republican leadership in the House. So I cannot understand why they will not let this legislation move on and go to conference. It is as if they are changing the rules in the middle of the game.

Legislation has come before the Senate, an amendment was offered and was adopted. Does that mean anytime legislation comes before this body and an amendment is offered to it we just close up and go on to something else? If that is the case, then we should do everything in committee and forget about action by the full Senate.

By holding up this important legislation, we are wasting valuable time that could be spent on, for example, the energy bill or campaign finance reform. I am terribly disappointed we are not moving forward. I hope cloture will be invoked tomorrow.

I say to my friend from Oregon, I have been tremendously impressed with the State of Oregon and their method of election. The two Senators from Oregon who voted in favor, of course, of the amendment that Senator WYDEN offered were elected by virtue of ballots cast by mail.

I followed very closely what went on in Oregon. I have not heard an iota from newspapers or any other commentary that there was anything wrong with the election. I have never known anyone to say there was any fraud in electing Senator WYDEN or Senator SMITH. They were elected by mail.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REID. I will be happy to yield for a question.

Mr. WYDEN. Not only is the Senator right, but Senator SMITH, in particular, deserves great credit because in a very close election, he made no assertions that there was any fraud in the election.

My question is, Is the Senator from Nevada aware of any evidence of any studies or analyses indicating that these vote-by-mail elections are tainted by fraud? I am not aware of any. Senator SMITH deserves a lot of credit because he could have raised that issue in our election, and he declined to do it.

Is the Senator aware of any evidence of fraud in these races?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I say to my friend, the evidence speaks for itself. The Senator from Oregon courageously stepped forward yesterday and was the only Republican to vote in favor of Senator WYDEN's amendment. Why did he do that? Because he knows the process in Oregon is good.

I think we, as Senators, have to do everything we can to stimulate voter turnout, to make it easier. I am in favor of voting 2 days. In Nevada, I am in favor of—we are a 24-hour town—voting all night long. We have to do everything we can to allow more participation.

I am so impressed with what North Dakota does. In North Dakota, if you want to vote, come on in, we will let you vote. They have same-day registration. Imagine that. I have talked to my friend from North Dakota, and I have never heard—and I do not think he has either—of any fraud.

We live in a world of computers. People are going to cheat. It is easy to find out if they cheat.

We should do everything we can to move forward with allowing people to vote. We should not make it harder for them to vote. We should make it easier for them to vote.

I applaud my friend from Oregon for working on this legislation so hard and, I think, making the legislation so much better. Recognizing there is a problem with it, let us work it out in conference and not say we are going to close up shop and not allow us to move forward on this legislation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I, too, compliment the distinguished Senator from Oregon for his outstanding work and leadership on this issue. He has gone the extra mile to find a way to resolve this matter. I know he has worked diligently over the last several weeks. He and I have talked about this matter on a number of occasions.

I think Oregon has been the leader in this country in innovative ways to encourage broader voter participation. He so ably represents his State. On this particular issue, no one has provided greater leadership and more insight on what we can do to improve participation than he has.

I join with my colleague from Nevada in thanking him and commending him for his efforts.

AMERICA'S STEEL INDUSTRY

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask the indulgence of my colleagues. I have a short statement that I will use my leader time to make. It involves a matter I know is of great concern to a number of our colleagues. I wish to make a couple of remarks with regard to the so-called 201 decision to be made by the administration relating to steel.

The last few years have been among the worst in history for the American steel industry. In just the last 2 years, 31 steel companies have filed for bankruptcy. Since January of 2000, more than 50 steel-making or related plants have shut down or been idle. Steel prices are now at their lowest level in 20 years.

This crisis has been devastating for steelworkers, their families, and communities. Over 43,000 steelworkers have

lost their jobs, and another 600,000 retirees and their surviving spouses are in danger of losing their health care benefits because the companies that once employed them are now facing bankruptcy.

A number of those families are in Washington today. In talking with them, one quickly realizes the numbers do not even begin to capture the pain they are feeling and the insecurity they face about their very future.

These families are hurting because this important sector of our economy is competing against global competitors who unfairly benefit from government subsidies or have resorted to flooding our Nation with imports.

Seven months ago, the President initiated what is called a section 201 investigation. This investigation, conducted by the International Trade Commission, found unanimously that imports have caused serious injury. That means under our trade laws the steel industry deserves an immediate and effective remedy.

In less than a week, by March 6, the President has to make his final ruling on what that remedy will be. But we already know the right remedy. The remedy is a 40-percent tariff rate for 4 years. That would be an effective enforcement of our trade laws and the right thing to do for hard-hit steel-worker families.

There is one other action the President must take, and that is lead on the issue of promoting consolidation and the protection of retirement health benefits, the benefits that were promised years ago to workers by companies that are now teetering on the verge of bankruptcy.

These benefits are so-called legacy costs. They really are a lifeline for 600,000 retirees and their surviving spouses and a measure of our commitment to the healthy and decent retirement these workers have earned.

America's steelworkers have literally built this Nation, from skyscrapers that define us, to the military that defends us. In the process, they have proven they can compete against any workers anywhere in the world and win, so long as the rules are fair.

In a very real sense, the future of the steel industry in America hinges on the administration's decision. So today we are asking the administration to use this historic opportunity to do the right thing for America's steelworkers, their industry, and the retirement health benefits on which they depend.

I yield the floor, and I thank my colleagues for their willingness to accommodate me.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri.

ELECTION REFORM

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I just happened to catch the last of the remarks of my very good friend, the distinguished majority whip, about what has happened with this election reform bill.

We ought to get the record straight. My good friend mentioned the fact that we seem to be holding this up over one little amendment. I will tell you what this is all about, Mr. President. We worked long and hard to come to a reasonable, responsible compromise because the Senator from Connecticut very eloquently made the case that we need to make it easier to vote, and I agree with that.

We worked on his portion of the bill. He made some compromises that took care of some of our concerns, but at the same time I tried to testify before the Rules Committee, and I came to the floor and made the case that there is another problem that is as serious a problem as making it difficult for somebody to vote, and that is diluting their vote with fraudulent, improper votes.

I have laid out for this body a number of times the fact that vote fraud continues to exist in Missouri and too many other States. So I proposed some solutions to give us some minimal protection against vote fraud in the future.

As part of the compromise, it was pointed out by my colleagues on the other side that requiring the photo ID may be too difficult, or requiring them to vote in person may be too difficult, although seven States do it, and I think that makes a lot of sense. St. Louis, MO, after we called attention to the vote fraud committed in November of 2000, decided to require photo IDs at the poll in the mayoral primary. Do you know something. It worked. We did not hear any complaints that people could not vote. They had an honest election in St. Louis.

I was willing to compromise with my colleagues, the Senator from Connecticut, the Senator from New York, and the Senator from New Jersey, and say if it is too burdensome to require a photo ID, let us go down the list and see what other things could be done. That is why we added that a bank statement with one's name and address can be used, or a utility bill, a government check, a paycheck, to try to make it possible so that one time in the process they would have to have proof that they were a real live human being.

Now our friends on the other side made fun of the fact that we had dogs registered to vote in Missouri and in Maryland. Well, that sounds kind of crazy, but the system is so sloppy, the motor voter law has made it possible for people to register dogs. I will guarantee there are a lot more fraudulent votes than just the dogs.

Some have objected and said we have not shown widespread fraud in St. Louis. Oh, yes, we have. Wherever we have looked, we have found fraud. Wherever we have looked, we have found ineligible people voting, dead people voting, felons voting—in Virginia, Wisconsin, California, Colorado, North Carolina, Indiana, Florida, and Texas.

What we found that in Missouri they had judges ordering people to be registered to vote. They went before a judge, and he said: Why are you not registered? One said: I am a Democrat. Another one said: I want to vote for Gore. Another one said: I have been a felon and forgot to reregister. Thirteen hundred people were registered by judge order. The secretary of state went back and did an exhaustive search on those 1,300 and found 97 percent of them were not lawful votes.

In the mayoral primary in 2001, 3,000 postcard registrations were dumped on the election board on the last day. At that point, my colleagues in the other party in St. Louis, who were a lot more concerned about stealing a mayor's race than they were about stealing a Governor's race or President's race or a Senate race, raised cane.

When those postcard registrations were looked at, they were all found to have had the same handwriting—many of them had the same handwriting. They were on one or two blocks. Those have all been turned over to the prosecuting authorities. We have not gotten any convictions yet.

We also know that right before the general election in November of 2000, 30,000 postcard registrations were dumped on the St. Louis city election board. Nobody has gone back and reviewed them, but the guess is that at least 15,000 of them were fraudulent. Is it not a little bit beyond credibility that St. Louis, which had 200,000 registered voters, would on the last 2 days of registration register 30,000 people, equal to 15 percent?

That is one of the reasons St. Louis has almost as many registered voters as it has adults. It would be truly remarkable if each one of those registrations equaled a registration of somebody who was an adult human being entitled to vote in Missouri. I do not believe it. We have not had the resources to go back and check.

Frankly, as the Senator from Pennsylvania pointed out yesterday, it is very difficult, particularly under motor voter, to prosecute people who register illegally. Why? Because there is nobody there. You sign somebody else's name, send it in, and say I promise to, with a signature affirmation and verification. I could register all my colleagues on the other side of the aisle in a Republican area of Missouri, and we would have signatures on their mail-in ballots every time. This time they might be voting our way rather than the other way.

I believe some of the people arguing against the bill yesterday were woefully uninformed about what this bill requires. I say to my friend from Oregon, this only applies to people registering after the bill becomes law. It only applies one time, either when you register or when you vote for the first time. You have to show something that would tend to prove you are a live human being, living where you said you were, entitled to vote.